

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/659,203	09/10/2003	Joy Sawyer Bloom	AD6930 US NA	5565		
23906 7	10/10/2006		EXAMINER			
E I DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY LEGAL PATENT RECORDS CENTER BARLEY MILL PLAZA 25/1128 4417 LANCASTER PIKE			WOODWARD, ANA LUCRECIA			
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			1711			
WILMINGTO	N, DE 19805		DATE MAILED: 10/10/2006			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			A 11 .41 .			<i></i>				
			Application	n No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary			10/659,203	3	BLOOM, JOY S	AWYER				
			Examiner		Art Unit					
			Ana L. Woo		1711					
The MAILIN Period for Reply	G DATE of this commun	ication appe	ears on the	cover sheet with the	correspondence a	ddress				
A SHORTENED S THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may after SIX (6) MONTHS (- If the period for reply sp - If NO period for reply is - Failure to reply within th Any reply received by th	TATUTORY PERIOD F TE OF THIS COMMUN be available under the provisions from the mailling date of this comme ecified above is less than thirty (3 specified above, the maximum st e set or extended period for reply the Office later than three months a stment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ICATION. of 37 CFR 1.136 nunication. i0) days, a reply valutory period will will, by statute, of	6(a). In no ever within the statutill apply and will cause the applic	nt, however, may a reply be tir tory minimum of thirty (30) day expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cation to become ABANDONE	rs will be considered time the mailing date of this D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ety. communication.				
Status	•	Λ								
1) Responsive	to communication(s) file	ed on Hug	aust 14	1,2006						
2a) This action is	FINAL.	2b)⊠ This a	action is no	n-final.						
3) Since this ap										
closed in acc	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.									
Disposition of Claims										
4) Claim(s) /-/ 4a) Of the ab 5) Claim(s) /-/ 6) Claim(s) /-/ 7) Claim(s)/	is/are pending in the ove claim(s) 2 5 is/a is/are allowed. is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restric	re withdraw	n from con		•	·				
Application Papers										
_	tion is objected to by th	e Examiner								
·	s) filed on is/are:			objected to by the	Examiner.					
	not request that any obje		-	•						
Replacement	drawing sheet(s) including	the correction	on is require	d if the drawing(s) is ob	jected to. See 37 C	FR 1.121(d).				
11)☐ The oath or d	eclaration is objected to	by the Exa	aminer. Not	te the attached Office	Action or form P	TO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S	.C. § 119									
a) All b) 3 1. Certific 2. Certific 3. Copies applica	nent is made of a claim Some * c) None of: ed copies of the priority ed copies of the priority s of the certified copies ation from the Internationed detailed Office action	documents documents of the priorit	have been have been ty documen (PCT Rule	n received. n received in Applicat nts have been received 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this Nationa	ıl Stage				
Attachment(s)				•						
1) Notice of References		TO 0 :0:		4) Interview Summary						
	n's Patent Drawing Review (Fe Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or ===================================			Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:		ΓO-152)				

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Claims 2-5 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected group, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on May 17, 2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1 and 6-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,789,523 (George et al).

George et al disclose a polyimide composition with improved wear resistance and reduced coefficient of friction. The composition comprises from 70-99.9 weight percent of at least one polyimide and from 0.1-30 weight percent of at least one sheet silicate, such as mica, reading on the corresponding component presently claimed. The composition can also contain a blend of the polyimide with from about 45 to 79.9 weight percent of at least one other polymer which is melt processable selected from polyamide and polyester resin, reading on the presently claimed thermoplastic resin. Furthermore, the composition includes up to 60 weight percent other additives, fillers and dry lubricants. In particular, the incorporation of graphite, reading on the corresponding component presently claimed, into the composition can extend the range of its utility as a wear resistant material. Another beneficial additive is carbon fiber, reading on the

Art Unit: 1711

corresponding component presently claimed, for the purpose of reducing coefficient of thermal expansion (column 3, line 66-column 4, line 8). Example 29 discloses a polyimide composition comprising 5 weight percent mica, 57 weight percent graphite and 5 weight percent carbon fiber. Said composition is governed by a coefficient of friction range of 0.06-0.13.

In essence, the example of George et al differs from the present claims in not expressly exemplifying a melt processable resin and in the high content of graphite used. With regard to the first difference, it is within the general disclosure of the reference to blend the polyimide resin with at least one melt processible polyester or polyamide. Accordingly, the further use of said melt processible resin for its expected additive effect would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art. As to the graphite content, it is maintained that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have employed the graphite in lower contents falling within the scope of the present claims because the additive can be used in an amount of up to about 60 weight percent based upon the total weight of the composition. In this regard, notice is made of the lower graphite contents used in examples 21 and 22. Accordingly, absent evidence of unusual or unexpected results, no criticality can be seen in applicants' claimed graphite content.

4. Claims 1, 7-9, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,294,654 (Hellstern-Burnell et al)).

Hellstern-Burnell et al disclose compositions comprising polyphenylene ether-based component, reading on the presently claimed thermoplastic resin, glass fibers, inorganic nonfibrous agents such as mica, reading on the presently claimed corresponding component, and carbon fibers or metal-coated graphite fibers, reading on the presently claimed corresponding

Art Unit: 1711

components. The mica is generally in the range of about 3% by weight by weight to about 12% by weight, based on the weight of the entire composition. The carbon fibers and metal-coated graphite fibers are present in the range of about 5% by weight to about 15% by weight, based on the weight of the entire composition.

In essence, the disclosure of the reference differs from the present claims in not expressly exemplifying the use of the metal-coated graphite fibers. It is maintained that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have used a combination of carbon fibers and metal-coated graphite fibers for their expected additive effect as carbon-based materials. This is because the reference teaches these materials as alternative carbon-based materials and as such, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use them in combination for the very same purpose. Accordingly, absent evidence of unusual or unexpected results for using these materials in combination, no patentability can be seen in the claimed subject matter.

5. Claims 1 and 6-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,844,036 (Hughes).

Hughes discloses compositions comprising a polyaryletherketone matrix, reading on the presently claimed thermoplastic resin, and at least two types of fillers. The first filler is a reinforcing fiber filler, which provides high strength and stiffness, such as carbon fiber, reading on the presently claimed corresponding component. The second filler is a non-thermoplastic immobilizing filler, which provides resistance to high temperature distortion, such as mica, reading on the presently claimed corresponding component. The composition can also contain a third filler type to confer lubrication, wear resistance properties, etc. such as graphite. Table 1 provides various formulations containing combinations of fillers, e.g., examples G and H.

Application/Control Number: 10/659,203

Art Unit: 1711

Page 5

In essence, the disclosure of the reference differs from the present claims in not expressly exemplifying the fillers carbon fiber, mica and graphite in combination. Said combination, however, is deemed to be within the general purview of the reference invention and thus obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art. For example, it would been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have substituted the calcium terephthalate powdered filler of examples G and H with mica as per these materials being alternatives as the immobilizing filler component (see, e.g., claim 14). Accordingly, absent evidence of unusual or unexpected results for using mica in place of the exemplified calcium terephthalate powdered filler, no patentability can be seen in the claimed subject matter.

Response to Amendment

6. Applicant's arguments filed August 14, 2006 have been fully considered and are effective in overcoming the previous rejection based upon Hirose.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ana L. Woodward whose telephone number is (571) 272-1082. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James J. Seidleck can be reached on (571) 272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/659,203

Art Unit: 1711

203 Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-2797 (toll-free).

Ana L. Woodward Primary Examiner Art Unit 1711

AW